Mr. William P. Farley, Assistant General Counsel 6/23/89
McGraw-Hill, Inc.
1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, N.Y. 10020

Dear Mr. Farley,

After two month you now say you are responding to my letter of two months ago. Not my recent letter to New American Library, of course. Just like after ignoring my protests earlier persisted until you were contracting with NAL, when suddenly I got two letters from Davis. He was careless in the second and send me a xerox of the indecent page that was marked "legal."

You conclude by telling me you trust the proposed changes satisfy my concerns. You know very well from my previous letters that they do not and more, cannot.

To describe what is said about me on page 414 as inaccurate is to praise it. It is a complete fabrication, as you certainly should know by now. There is no way in which you can doctor it to keep it from being hurtful to me. Know.

I recognize your and Davis' problem with this. No matter how much he believes it he and you have a phony book that was safe because there is little chance Marcello will sue. But there was no reason to believe that Marcello gave a damn about what the House assassins or the FBI said about him. So Davis used me as the basis for his complete fabrication to make it appear that the guilty Marcello was deeply concerned. And you and Davis do not want to be either honest or decent, preferring to have that feeble peg for what all is hung on it.

You do not believe, you now say, that you have hurt my reputation or caused me any distress. Having the dead man you decribe as the mafia's top lawyer rummaging around my place for much of a year when it is totally false is not hurtful, no cause for distress?

You profess not to see my concern over what you change a little bit, not unusual for lawyers, or refer to merely as an "interview" Davis said he had with me. What he actually said is "formal interview." He never indicated anything of the sort and I assume the opposite.

In short, he is not content to defame me on a total fabrication, he has in addition the need to trade on my name.

You refer to his "appreciation" of me. Not only the forgoing is clear on that. There is also the matter that despite my several letters has been ingored: the assistant he had working here either sent him by mistake or misfiled the brief correspondence I had with Jack Wasserman. I asked for copies. Is that asking too much? Or are you and he afraid I may show it to someone who might ask me about the book?

If he wants to cite my published work, fine. If he wants to thank me for giving him access to the records I got under FOIA, fine. But I want nothing that in any way, no matter how indirectly, can be interpreted as associating me with that book.

cc:NAL

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg

Harold